IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Conrad K. Meyer	) Confirmation No: 4113
	) Group Art Unit: 2154
Serial No.: 10/047,629	)
	) Examiner: Avery, Lin, Wen-Tai
Filed: January 15, 2002	)
	) Atty. Docket No.: 10014352-1
For: System and Method for Locating a	)
Resource Locator Associated with a	)
Resource of Interest	)

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed September 21, 2006, responding to the final Office Action mailed June 21, 2006.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees are required to consider this Appeal Brief. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

1

I. **Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

II. **Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no known related appeals or interferences that will affect or be affected by a decision in this Appeal.

III. **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-29 stand finally rejected. No claims have been allowed. The final rejections of claims 1-29 are appealed.

IV. **Status of Amendments**

This application was originally filed on January 15, 2002, with twenty-nine (29) claims. In a Response filed January August 5, 2005, Applicant amended claims 13, 18, and 24. In a Response filed December 20, 2005, Applicant amended claims 1, 8, 13, 18, and 24. In a Response filed May 5, 2006, Applicant amended claims 1, 8, 13, and 18. In a Response filed August 21, 2006, Applicant presented remarks without any claim amendments. The claims in the

attached Claims Appendix (see below) reflect the present state of Applicant's claims.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The claimed inventions are summarized below with reference numerals and references to the written description ("specification") and drawings. The subject matter described in the following appears in the original disclosure at least where indicated, and may further appear in other places within the original disclosure.

Embodiments according to independent claim 1 describe a method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL). The method comprises receiving input of a RL, where the RL corresponds to a resource (FIG. 1, 102). Applicant's specification, step 410 of FIG. 4A. The method further comprises soliciting input of search terms if the RL is invalid and receiving input of the search terms. Applicant's specification, page 7, lines 4-14; steps 418-420 of FIG. 4A; and FIG. 5B. Such a method further comprises searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with the search terms and presenting a list of all valid RLs in the predetermined index with addresses that correspond to the search terms. Applicant's specification, pages 7-8, lines 22-4; steps 422-424 of FIG. 4A; and FIG. 5C. The method further comprises receiving selection of a RL from the list and retrieving and displaying content from the selected RL. Applicant's specification, pages 9-10, lines 21-1 and step 414 of FIG. 4A.

Embodiments according to independent claim 8 describe a method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL). The method comprises receiving input of a RL, where the RL corresponds to an address for a resource (FIG. 1, 102). Applicant's specification, step 410 of FIG. 4A. The method further comprises determining if the RL is valid and soliciting input of a RL search string if the RL is invalid. Applicant's specification, page 7, lines 4-14; steps 412-418 of FIG. 4A; and FIG. 5B. Such a method further comprises receiving input of the RL search string and searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with the RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by the RL search string. Applicant's specification, pages 7-8, lines 4-14; steps 412-424 of FIG. 4A; FIG. 5B; and FIG. 5C.

Embodiments according to independent claim 13 describe a method of selecting a resource locator (RL). The method comprises receiving input of a RL at a user device (FIG. 1, 110), where the RL corresponds to a resource. (FIG. 1, 102). Applicant's specification, step 410 of FIG. 4A. The method further comprises determining if the RL is valid and generating a RL search string at the user device if the RL is invalid. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 5-12; steps 452-458 of FIG. 4B; and FIG. 5D. Such a method further comprises searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with the RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of the RL search string, wherein the RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and the valid RLs have names that correspond to the RL search string. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 15-20; page 10, lines 16-24; and steps 460-462 of FIG. 4B.

4

Embodiments according to independent claim 18 describe a system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL). The system comprises a controller (FIG. 2, 202) for receiving a RL search string from a user device (FIG. 1, 110), wherein the RL search string is generated at the user device (FIG. 1, 110) based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device (FIG. 1, 110). The system further comprises memory (FIG. 2, 206) associated with the controller (FIG. 2, 202) for storing a list of valid RLs (FIG. 1, 116). The controller (FIG. 2, 202) is further configured to search the list of valid RLs (FIG. 1, 116) to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of the RL search string, wherein the RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and the valid RLs have names that correspond to the RL search string. Applicant's specification, pages 7-10, lines 4-1; FIG. 4A; FIG. 5B; and FIG. 5C.

Embodiments according to independent claim 24 describe a system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL). The system comprises a controller (FIG. 2, 202) for receiving a RL from a user device (FIG. 1, 110) and memory (FIG. 2, 206) associated with the controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device (FIG. 1, 110). The controller (FIG. 2, 202) is configured to generate a RL search string if the RL is determined to be invalid. The RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein the RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource (FIG. 1, 102) and the valid RLs have names that correspond to the RL search string. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 5-20; page 10, lines 16-24; FIG. 4B; and FIG. 5D.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The following grounds of rejections are to be reviewed on appeal:

Claims 1-3, 7-22, and 24-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Belfiore* (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459).

Claims 4-6, 23, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Belfiore* in view of *Ling* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0059192).

VII. Arguments

The Appellant respectfully submits that Applicant's claims 1-3, 7-22, and 24-28 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 and claims 4-6, 23, and 29 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals overturn the final rejection of those claims at least for the reasons discussed below.

A. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 7-22, and 24-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Belfiore* (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459).

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

6

1. The *Belfiore* Disclosure

Belfiore discloses at most a system that provides:

> a mechanism for a computer system to automatically and intelligently determine what a user intended when the user entered text within an Address box or other user interface element. Often users improperly enter URLs or enter search terms in a user interface element that requires URLs. The present invention identifies many such instances and automatically retrieves information regarding appropriate web sites so that the user can gain access to the desired web site. <u>The present invention does not require added effort from the user</u> and helps increase the resilience of the system to user input errors.

Col. 4, lines 29-40. (Emphasis added).

2. Applicant's Claim 1

Applicant's independent claim 1 provides as follows:

> A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
> receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponds to a resource;
> *soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid;*
> receiving input of said search terms;
> *searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms;*
> *presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index with addresses that correspond to said search terms;*
> receiving selection of a RL from said list; and
> retrieving and displaying content from said selected RL.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid," "searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms," or "presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index with

addresses that correspond to said search terms," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Rather, *Belfiore* discloses at most a system that provides:

a mechanism for a computer system to automatically and intelligently determine what a user intended when the user entered text within an Address box or other user interface element. Often users improperly enter URLs or enter search terms in a user interface element that requires URLs. The present invention identifies many such instances and automatically retrieves information regarding appropriate web sites so that the user can gain access to the desired web site. <u>The present invention does not require added effort from the user</u> and helps increase the resilience of the system to user input errors.

Col. 4, lines 29-40. (Emphasis added). Thus, *Belfiore* fails to disclose the step of "<u>soliciting</u> input of search terms if said RL is invalid," since *Belfiore* teaches that search terms are automatically processed from the terms initially inputted by a user. After terms are determined to be invalid, the user is not solicited for additional input. Rather, the system automatically processes the terms without user involvement. Therefore, *Belfiore* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1, such as soliciting input of search terms.

Further, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms [that were solicited from the user in response to an invalid RL]." For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index with addresses that correspond to said search terms," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from

8

body of web page, *etc.*) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses that correspond to said search terms are presented.

In the Office Action mailed June 21, 2006, it states that "[s]ince the address box [in *Belfiore*] is always available for any subsequent attempts . . . the act of 'soliciting input of search term' is inherent, though implicit to Belfore's system." Page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, if the address box is always available regardless of the situation, *Belfiore* does not seem to suggest "soliciting input of search terms <u>if said RL is invalid</u>," as recited in the claim. In addition, if the address box is always available and always had the label "address" next to it as shown in the figures, this seemingly fails to teach or suggest "soliciting input of search terms," as recited in the claim. Rather, it seemingly suggests that input of an address is desired.

The Office Action mailed June 21, 2006 further states that "it is noted that step 72 of Fig.4 is part of the auto-search. That is, if no valid results turn out after searching for the entered terms, the process would produce an error message. This is not related to the 'searching in response to invalid RL' feature." Page 5. Applicants submit, however, if this is the case, then there does not appear to be any searching in response to an invalid RL being performed in *Belfiore*. For example, in step 92, of Fig. 7, *Belfiore* checks the syntax and format of an entered URL to determine if it is valid. If the format is not valid, then the autosearch process is implemented. In checking the format of the entered URL, the URL is checked to see if it contains a slash ("/") or a period ("."), for example. *See* col. 5, lines 25-36. *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a

9

predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms," as recited in the claim, however.

For at least these reasons, *Belfiore* is not adequate to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claim 1 <u>in the manner claimed</u>. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Belfiore,* and the rejection should be withdrawn.

3. Applicant's Claims 2-3 and 7

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-3 and 7 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-3 and 7 contain all the features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 2-3 and 7 should be withdrawn.

4. Applicant's Claim 8

As provided in independent claim 8, Applicant claims:

> A method of accessing a resource associated with a
> resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
> receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponding to an address
> for a resource;
> determining if said RL is valid;
> ***soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is
> invalid;***
> receiving input of said RL search string; and
> ***searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance
> with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet
> criteria specified by said RL search string.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least

"soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," or "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 8.

Rather, *Belfiore* discloses at most a system that provides:

> a mechanism for a computer system to automatically and intelligently determine what a user intended when the user entered text within an Address box or other user interface element. Often users improperly enter URLs or enter search terms in a user interface element that requires URLs. The present invention identifies many such instances and automatically retrieves information regarding appropriate web sites so that the user can gain access to the desired web site. The present invention does not require added effort from the user and helps increase the resilience of the system to user input errors.

Col. 4, lines 29-40. (Emphasis added). Thus, *Belfiore* fails to disclose the step of "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," since *Belfiore* teaches that search terms are automatically processed from the terms initially inputted by a user. After terms are determined to be invalid, the user is not solicited for additional input. Rather, the system automatically processes the terms without user involvement. Therefore, *Belfiore* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 8, such as soliciting input of search terms.

Further, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string [that was provided in response to an invalid RL] to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string." For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends.

11

In the Office Action mailed June 21, 2006, it states that "[s]ince the address box [in *Belfiore*] is always available for any subsequent attempts . . . the act of 'soliciting input of search term' is inherent, though implicit to Belfore's system." Page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, if the address box is always available regardless of the situation, *Belfiore* does not seem to suggest "soliciting input of a RL search string <u>if said RL is invalid</u>," as recited in the claim. In addition, if the address box is always available and always had the label "address" next to it as shown in the figures, this seemingly fails to teach or suggest "soliciting input of search terms," as recited in the claim. Rather, it seemingly suggests that input of an address is desired.

The Office Action mailed June 21, 2006 further states that "it is noted that step 72 of Fig.4 is part of the auto-search. That is, if no valid results turn out after searching for the entered terms, the process would produce an error message. This is not related to the 'searching in response to invalid RL' feature." Page 5. Applicants submit, however, that if this is the case, there does not appear to be any searching in response to an invalid RL being performed in *Belfiore*, then. For example, in step 92, of Fig. 7, *Belfiore* checks the syntax and format of an entered URL to determine if it is valid. If the format is not valid, then the autosearch process is implemented. In checking the format of the entered URL, the URL is checked to see if it contains a slash ("/") or a period ("."), for example. *See* col. 5, lines 25-36. *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string," as recited in the claim, however.

12

For at least these reasons, *Belfiore* is not adequate to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claim 8 <u>in the manner claimed</u>. Therefore, claim 8 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

5. Applicant's Claims 9-12

Because independent claim 8 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 9-12 (which depend from independent claim 8) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 9-12 contain all the features of independent claim 8. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 9-12 should be withdrawn.

6. Applicant's Claim 13

As provided in independent claim 13, Applicant claims:

> A method of selecting a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
> receiving input of a RL at a user device, said RL corresponding to a resource;
> determining if said RL is valid;
> generating a RL search string at the user device if said RL is invalid; and
> ***searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search

string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from body of web page, *etc.*) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses or names that correspond to said search terms are presented.

For at least this reason, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, *Belfiore* is not adequate to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claim 13 in the manner claimed. Therefore, claim 13 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

7. Applicant's Claims 14-17

Because independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 14-17 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 14-17 contain all the features of independent claim 13. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 14-17 should be withdrawn.

8. Applicant's Claim 18

As provided in independent claim 18, Applicant claims:

> A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:
> controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device, wherein said RL search string is generated at the user device based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device;
> memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs; and
> **said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.**

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid

RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 18.

For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends. Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from body of web page, *etc.*) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses or names that correspond to said search terms are presented.

For at least this reason, *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, <u>wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string</u>," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, *Belfiore* is not adequate to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claim 18 <u>in the manner claimed</u>. Therefore, claim 18 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

9. Applicant's Claims 19-22

Because independent claim 18 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 19-22 (which depend from independent claim 18) are allowable

as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 19-22 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 18. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 19-22 should be withdrawn.

10. Applicant's Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicant claims:

> A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:
> controller for receiving a RL from a user device;
> *memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device;*
> *said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid; and*
> *said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Belfiore* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device; said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid; and said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited and emphasized above in claim 24.

For example, in FIG. 4, *Belfiore* teaches that in response to an invalid URL (step 70), the system displays an error message (step 72) and the process ends.

Accordingly, *Belfiore* fails to teach "said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," since *Belfiore* teaches that a list of web sites are presented with content (*e.g.*, text from title of web page, text from body of web page, *etc.*) that corresponds to the search terms and does not show that a list of addresses or names that correspond to said search terms are presented.

In the Office Action mailed June 21, 2006, it states that "[s]ince the address box [in *Belfiore*] is always available for any subsequent attempts . . . the act of 'soliciting input of search term' is inherent, though implicit to Belfore's system." Page 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, if the address box is always available regardless of the situation, *Belfiore* does not seem to suggest "said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid," as recited in the claim. In addition, if the address box is always available and always had the label "address" next to it as shown in the figures, this seemingly fails to teach or suggest "soliciting input of search terms," as recited in the claim. Rather, it seemingly suggests input of an address is desired.

The Office Action mailed June 21, 2006 further states that "it is noted that step 72 of Fig.4 is part of the auto-search. That is, if no valid results turn out after searching for the entered terms, the process would produce an error message. This is not related to the 'searching in response to invalid RL' feature." Page 5. Applicants submit, however, that if this is the case, then there does not appear to be any searching in response to an invalid RL being performed in *Belfiore*. For

example, in step 92, of Fig. 7, *Belfiore* checks the syntax and format of an entered URL to determine if it is valid. If the format is not valid, then the autosearch process is implemented. In checking the format of the entered URL, the URL is checked to see if it contains a slash ("/") or a period ("."), for example. *See* col. 5, lines 25-36. *Belfiore* fails to teach or suggest "said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string," as recited in the claim, however.

For at least these reasons, *Belfiore* is not adequate to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of claim 24 <u>in the manner claimed</u>. Therefore, claim 24 is not anticipated by *Belfiore*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

11. Applicant's Claims 25-28

Because independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 25-28 (which depend from independent claim 24) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 25-28 contain all the features of independent claim 24. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 25-28 should be withdrawn.

B.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-6, 23, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Belfiore* in view of *Ling*   (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0059192). It is well-established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references,

19

the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either

implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In*

Re Dow Chemical, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*,

208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

1.   The *Belfiore* Disclosure

Belfiore discloses at most a system that provides:

> a mechanism for a computer system to automatically and intelligently determine what a user intended when the user entered text within an Address box or other user interface element. Often users improperly enter URLs or enter search terms in a user interface element that requires URLs. The present invention identifies many such instances and automatically retrieves information regarding appropriate web sites so that the user can gain access to the desired web site. <u>The present invention does not require added effort from the user</u> and helps increase the resilience of the system to user input errors.

Col. 4, lines 29-40. (Emphasis added).

2.   The *Ling* Disclosure

Ling discloses at most a system where:

> the user would enter the request string in the address line of the browser being used. The browser would then attempt to access the page of the web-site specified by the request string, but as the page address is invalid overall, an error message is generated. This error message is then trapped. . . . Trapping of the error message initiates the completion of the remaining procedure steps[, where] the results are then displayed in the browser that the user is utilising. In this way, a user will need <u>only</u> to enter the requested string and then await the return of the duly processed results.

Paragraph 0027 (Emphasis added).

Ling apparently teaches that search terms are inputted without solicitation. For example, *Ling* clearly describes a system where a user inputs search terms in an "address bar" that is requesting address information which then causes an "error message" to be generated that is "trapped" and prevented from being received by the browser. As such, the address bar of the browser is clearly requesting address information and not search terms.

3. Applicant's Claim 4-6, 23, and 29

All of the claimed features of independent claims 1, 18, and 24 are not taught and suggested by *Belfiore*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Ling* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Belfiore* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claims 4-6, 23, and 29 (which depend from respective independent claims 1, 18, and 24). Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Belfiore* with *Ling* has not been made. Therefore, the rejections of claims 4-6, 23, and 29 should be withdrawn.

VIII. <u>Conclusion</u>

In summary, it is Applicant's position that Applicant's claims are patentable over the applied cited art references and that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Board of Appeals overturn the Examiner's rejection and allow Applicant's pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Charles W. Griggers
Registration No. 47,283

Claims Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii)

The following are the claims that are involved in this Appeal.

1.   A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:

receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponds to a resource;

soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid;

receiving input of said search terms;

searching a predetermined index of addresses of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms;

presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index with addresses that correspond to said search terms;

receiving selection of a RL from said list; and

retrieving and displaying content from said selected RL.

2.   The method of claim 1, wherein said RL comprises a uniform resource locator (URL).

3.   The method of claim 1, wherein said resource comprises a resource accessible via the Internet.

4.   The method of claim 1, wherein said search term comprises a wildcard representing a predetermined plurality of characters.

5.   The method of claim 1, wherein said search term comprises a wildcard.

6.   The method of claim 5, wherein said search term is representative of a range of values.

7.   The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of retrieving and displaying content from said resource where said RL is valid.

8.   A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:

receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponding to an address for a resource;

determining if said RL is valid;

soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid;

receiving input of said RL search string; and

searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL search string.

9.   The method of claim 8, wherein said RL comprises a uniform resource locator (URL).

10. The method of claim 8, further comprising the step of displaying a list of valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string.

11. The method of claim 10, further comprising the step of receiving a selection of a RL specified by said list of valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string.

12. The method of claim 11, further comprising the step of accessing and displaying content from a resource associated with said selected RL.

13. A method of selecting a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:

receiving input of a RL at a user device, said RL corresponding to a resource;

determining if said RL is valid;

generating a RL search string at the user device if said RL is invalid; and

searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

14. The method of claim 13, wherein said RL comprises a uniform resource locator (URL).

15. The method of claim 13, further comprising the step of displaying a list of valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string.

16. The method of claim 15, further comprising the step of receiving a selection of a RL on said list of valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string.

17. The method of claim 16, further comprising the step of accessing and displaying content from a resource associated with said selected RL.

18. A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:

controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device, wherein said RL search string is generated at the user device based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device;

memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs; and

said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

19. The system of claim 18, wherein said RL comprises a uniform resource locator (URL).

20. The system of claim 18, wherein said controller is further configured to generate a list of valid RLs meeting criteria of said RL search string.

21. The system of claim 20, wherein said controller is further configured to forward said list of valid RLs meeting said criteria to said user device.

22. The system of claim 21, wherein said controller forwards said list of valid RLs to said user device via a network.

23. The system of claim 18, wherein said RL search string comprises a wildcard character representing a predetermined character.

24. A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:

controller for receiving a RL from a user device;

memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device;

said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid; and

said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

27

25.   The system of claim 24, wherein said RL comprises a uniform resource locator (URL).

26.   The system of claim 24, wherein said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to identify valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string.

27.   The system of claim 26, wherein said controller is further configured to forward said list of valid RLs meeting said criteria to said user device.

28.   The system of claim 27, wherein said controller forwards said list of valid RLs to said user device via a network.

29.   The system of claim 24, wherein said wildcard represents a predetermined character.

<u>Evidence Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix)</u>

There is no extrinsic evidence to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no evidence is presented in this Appendix.

Related Proceedings Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x)

There are no related proceedings to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no such proceedings are identified in this Appendix.